

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09826 282257Z

67

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 IO-14 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 DRC-01 MC-02 /166 W
----- 105938

R 281854Z NOV 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 750

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T VIENNA 9826

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS - FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVES CONVERSATION
WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE KHLESTOV

REF: VIENNA 9781

FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE CAGIATTI'S CONVERSATION
NOV 26 WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE KHLESTOV, AS DESCRIBED REFTEL.

TEXT WAS DISTRIBUTED AT NOV 28 AHG MEETING.

BEGIN TEXT

CONVERSATION WITH AMBASSADOR KHLESTOV

THE ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVE RECEIVED THIS MORNING A VISIT FROM
SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE AT REQUEST OF THE LATTER.

AFTER SOME FAVORABLE COMMENTS ON EXCELLENT DEVELOPMENT BILATERAL
ECONOMICAL RELATIONS, AMBASSADOR KHLESTOV TOUCHED FOLLOWING SUBJECTS.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09826 282257Z

1. FLANK COUNTRIES. SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE ASKED INFORMATION ON MEAN-

ING OF POINT 8 OF ATLANTIC PROPOSAL. HE NOTED THAT SOVIET WITHDRAWN
TROOPS WOULD GO BACK TO URSS, AND THEREFORE WONDERED IF NATO MEANT TO

REFER TO NON REDEPLOYMENT IN CAUSCASUS (NOTING INCIDENTALLY THAT MOSCOW WOULD NOT HAVE ANY INTEREST IN REDEPLOYING ARMoured DIVISIONS IN THAT MOUNTAINOUS REGION). IT. REP. REPLIED THAT POINT 8 HAD PURPOSE OF EMPHASIZING IMPORTANCE OF SAFEGUARDING SECURITY OF FLANK COUNTRIES AND THAT WAYS AND MEANS TO THIS PURPOSE WILL HAVE TO BE NEGOTIATED.

2. "EUROPEAN CLAUSE". SOV. REP. ASKED INFORMATION ON CONTENTS OF ATLANTIC RESERVES ON FUTURE EUROPE, WONDERING IF WE WOULD AVOID ANY FIRM ENGAGEMENT FOR THE POSSIBLE FUTURE UNITARIAN STATE. HE ASKED ALSO INFORMATION ON MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFICATION PROCESS PARTICULARLY IN DEFENCE FIELD. ITALIAN REP. EXPLAINED UNIFICATION PROCESS IS STILL IN FULL DEVELOPMENT AND EUROPEAN UNION SHOULD EMERGE IN 1980. THEREFORE THE NINE COULD NOT ACCEPT ENGAGEMENTS WHICH COULD HINDER OR JEOPARDIZE CONCRETE REALIZATION OF FUTURE UNITARIAN STATE, FOR INSTANCE BY ACCEPTING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES NEUTRALIZED STATUS (TYPE RAPACKI-PLAN) WHICH WOULD NOT ALLOW THEM TO FULLY PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE UNITARIAN STATE. SOV.REP ASKED HOW FUTURE EUROPE COULD BE ONLY PARTIALLY SUBJECT TO POSSIBLE AGREED DISARMAMENT MEASURES AND CONTROLS, BUT SEEMED CONVINCED WHEN ITALREP EXPLAINED THAT SUCH MEASURES COULD EASILY REFER TO ONLY A PORTION OF AN EXISTING STATE (I.E. IN THE PRELIMINARY TALKS IT WAS SUGGESTED FOR EXAMPLE THAT NORD-EAST ITALY COULD BE CONSIDERED PART OF CENTRAL EUROPE, JUST AS THEORETICALLY COULD ALSO BE BIELORUSSIA). SOVREP ASKED IF IN THE CASE GERMANS WOULD BE FREE TO STATION OWN TROOPS AND ARMAMENTS OUTSIDE THE REDUCTION AREA. ITREP ANSWERED THEORETICALLY YES, JUST AS POLES COULD THEORETICALLY STATION OWN TROOPS FOR INSTANCE IN URSS.

3. FRANCE. SOVREP ASKED IF FRANCE WAS TAKING ANY PART IN ATLANTIC CAUCUS: ANSWER WAS NO.

4. HUNGARY. SOVREP ASKED IF FREQUENT ATLANTIC REFERENCE ON HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION MEANT CHANGE OF POSITION ON ITALIAN PARTICIPATION. ITREP ANSWERED THAT NO CHANGE HAD TAKEN PLACE: ITALY IS INDISPUTABLY A SOUTHERN COUNTRY; WHILE HUNGARY IS GEOGRAPHICALLY PART OF CENTRAL EUROPE; THEREFORE WE KEEP RESERVING OUR POSITION. SOVREP CONFIRMED
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09826 282257Z

THAT THEIR POSITION WAS ALSO UNCHANGED.

5. GROUND FORCES. SOVREP WONDERED WHY WE REFUSE TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES, WHICH CONTRIBUTE DECISIVELY TO TOTAL BALANCE OF FORCES, WHILE GROUND FORCES ARE ONLY A SECION OF IT (AND THE ONLY SECTION IN WHICH SOCIALIST HAD QUANTITATIVE ADVANTAGE). ITREP POINTED OUT THAT AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES ARE NOT ONLY EASY TO REINTRODUCE IN SHORT TIME (AIR FORCE) OR IN CLANDESTINE WAYS (NUCLEAR WARHEADS), BUT ARE PART OF A MUCH WIDER MILITARY BALANCE (IN WHICH, FOR INSTANCE, ALSO THE MANY HUNDRED MRBM LOCATED IN URSS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED). THE EXAMINATION OF SUCH PROBLEMS WOULD ENORMOUSLY COMPLICATE THE NEGOTIATIONS AND PERHAPS HAMPER THEIR SUCCESS. GROUND FORCES ARE A CLEARLY DEFINED ENTITY IN THE CONTEMPLATED AREA OF REDUCTIONS, AND THEREFORE EAST TO CONSIDER, EVALUATE AND CONTROL.

SOVREP DID NOT DISPUTE THIS POINT BUT WONDERED IF WE CONSIDERED POSSIBLE TO TAKE AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES IN FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS. ITALREP REFERRED HIM TO THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR A RESPONSIBLE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION, BUT PERSONALLY EXPRESSED THE OPINION THAT THEORETICALLY ANY SUBJECT COULD BE THE OBJECT OF NEGOTIATIONS IN FUTURE.

6. COMMON CEILING. ITALREP WONDERED IF SOVIET WOULD ACCEPT CONCEPT OF FINAL COMMON CEILING, WHICH CONSTITUTES ONLY RATIONAL SOLUTION OF THE SECURITY PROBLEM IN CENTRAL EUROPE. IT IS CLEAR THAT IF ONE OF THE

TWO SIDES WERE TO ASK FOR A HIGHER "CEILING" FOR ITSELF, THIS WOULD MEAN THAT IT CONSIDERS ITS OWN SOLDIERS LESS WELL TRAINED AND ITS TANKS WORSE THAN THOSE OF THE OTHER SIDE. SOVREP LOOKED RATHER EMBARRASSED BUT VOLUNTEERED THAT THE CONCEPT OF COMMON CEILING COULD PERHAPS

BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, ALTHOUGH NO FINAL DECISION IN THIS DIRECTION HAD BEEN TAKEN.

7. FORCES TO BE REDUCED. SOVREP ASKED WHY WE REFUSED TO REDUCE NATIONAL FORCES AND EMPHASIZED INTEREST FOR REDUCTION OF GERMAN FORCES, WHICH SPECIALLY CONCERN URSS. ITALREP MANIFESTED SURPRISE FOR THIS CONCERN IN VIEW OF THE ENORMOUS DIFFERENCE OF MILITARY CAPABILITIES BETWEEN URSS AND GERMANY AND OF THE FACT THAT SOVIET UNION IS MAJOR NUCLEAR POWER. HE POINTED OUT THAT SECOND AGREEMENT WOULD ADDRESS ALL FORCES REMAINING IN THE AREA AND REMEMBERED TRADITIONAL SOVIET POSITION AT GENEVA CONFERENCE THAT DISARMAMENT SHOULD BEGIN WITH
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 09826 282257Z

FOREIGN TROOPS. SOVREP DID NOT PRESS THE POINT FURTHER.

8. TREATY FORM. ITALREP, DEVELOPING THE SUBJECT OF SECOND AGREEMENT LINKED WITH THE FIRST AS PROPOSED BY WEST, NOTED THAT COMMON GROUND COULD PERHAPS BE FOUND ON THIS ISSUE. SOVIET PROPOSAL IS SUBSTANTIALLY BASED ON AN AGREEMENT IN TWO PHASES (FIRST PHASE WAS OBVIOUSLY SO CLEARLY UNBALANCED AND INACCEPTABLE THE SOVIET PROPOSAL SHOULD REALLY BE CONSIDERED AS SUGGESTING ONLY TWO PHASES: SOVREP DID NOT CONTEST THIS POINT). ON THE OTHER HAND THE ATLANTIC PROPOSAL IS BASED ON TWO AGREEMENTS LINKED TOGETHER. SOVREP SEEMED INTERESTED IN THIS PARALLEL AND ASKED HOW TO CONCEIVE THIS LINK, GIVING IMPRESSION THAT UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS SUCH A SOLUTION COULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION.

9. GENERAL REMARKS. SOVREP GAVE GENERALLY IMPRESSION OF LOOKING FOR COMMON GROUND IN BOTH PROPOSALS IN ORDER TO OBTAIN QUICK RESULTS (ALTHOUGH HE DID NOT SPEAK OF TIMING OF NEGOTIATIONS). HE ACTUALLY STRESSED ALL POSITIVE POINTS ON BOTH SIDES, CAPABLE TO ADVANCE FAVORABLE SOLUTION OF NEGOTIATIONS.

ATMOSPHERE WAS ALL THE TIME VERY OPEN AND CORDIAL: SOVREP MADE EFFORTS TO APPEAR OPTIMISTIC AND OPEN TO EVERY REASONABLE SUGGESTION IN THE INTEREST OF THE SUCCESS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. END TEXT. HUMES

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 12 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NEGOTIATIONS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, TROOP REDUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: mcintyresh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA09826
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731168/abqcelnt.tel
Line Count: 164
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: VIENNA 9781
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: mcintyresh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 16 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <16-Jul-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <27-Aug-2001 by mcintyresh>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: ITALIAN REPRESENTATIVES CONVERSATION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE KHLESTOV
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO NATO BRUSSELS
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005